UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,206	07/24/2003	Harry Israel Ringermacher	120631-1	4236
	7590 06/26/200 ECTRIC COMPANY	EXAMINER		
GLOBAL RES	EARCH	VERBITSKY, GAIL KAPLAN		
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59 NISKAYUNA, NY 12309		+439	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2855	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ldocket@crd.ge.com rosssr@crd.ge.com parkskl@crd.ge.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/627,206	RINGERMACHER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Gail Verbitsky	2855		

	Gail Verbitsky	2855	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	, on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company of the compa</li></ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a final rejection and a final rejection, be a final rejection final rejec	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all			-
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will	•	_
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
See Continuation Sheet.  12. ☑ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Gail Verbitsky/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2855	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant states that the prior art does not teach a flash having a duration D=T2-T1. This argument is not persuasive because this limitation is not stated in the claims. It is the claims that define the claimed invention, and it is claims, not specification that are anticipated or unpatentable. Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc., 7 USPQ2d 1064.

Applicant states that the prior art does not teach a timing generator with a control signal T2. This argument is not persuasive because

Dennewitz discloses a generating means with first time T0 (or T1) and second time T2 for controlling a cooling mode.

Applicant states that in Dennewitz, the quench time is determined by the reflection light (as opposed to the present invention?). This argument is not persuasive because, in the rejection on the merits, the Examiner uses Dennewitz as a secondary reference only for its teaching of the timing generating means having T1 and T2, as claimed by applicant to quench the lamp. How is the time of quench is determined is irrelevant.

Applicant states that the Examiner's arguments stating that the control is transistorized are wrong. This argument is not persuasive because the entire circuit (including transistors), as shown in Fig. 1, is responsive to the reflection light and converts data in a quench time duration (time duration generator).

Therefore, in combination with Article, Dennewitz teaches all the limitations claimed by Applicant.